

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held June 4, 2013

A special business meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Supervisors present in addition to Mr. Hawk were: William C. Seeds, Sr., William L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman, and David B. Blain.

Supervisors present from West Hanover Township were: Jay Megonnell, Vice-Chairman, Donald Steinmeier, Harold Harman and Gloria Zimmerman.

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Lower Paxton Township Manager; Steve Stine, Lower Paxton Township Solicitor; Elizabeth England, West Hanover Township Manager, West Hanover Township; and Ted Robinson and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Discussion on the selection of a consultant for engineering services for the
Jonestown Road Bridge Replacement Project

Mr. Hawk noted that the purpose of the joint meeting is to rank the consultants for the Jonestown Road Replacement Project.

Mr. Wolfe explained that this is an advertised public meeting and minutes will be taken for both bodies to approve.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he is the Township Manager for Lower Paxton Township and suggested that it would be a good time for everyone to introduce themselves to each other. All present did so.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Ms. England and he have been working with PennDOT in the process to select an engineer to replace the Jonestown Road Bridge. He noted that the bridge is jointly owned by both municipalities and straddles Beaver Creek. He noted that the bridge was built in 1925, is posted at a weight limit of 20 tons which is a very low weight posting for a

bridge that handles 2,500 vehicles per day and a significant collector for municipal vehicles between the two townships.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Annual Bridge Inspection Report is prepared by Herbert Roland and Grubic, Inc. (HRG) on behalf of Dauphin County. He noted that Dauphin County inspects all municipal bridges on the Township's behalf at their cost, retaining HRG to do that work. He explained, in the last bridge inspection report, it was concluded that the condition is serious and the primary concern is the deteriorating condition of the fascia beams for both spans. He noted that the 2012 report states that the condition has worsen since the 2011 report was completed, and today he received the 2013 report which he has not had time to review yet.

Mr. Wolfe noted that due to the condition of the bridge it is recommended that the bridge be considered for a complete replacement in the near future. He noted that both municipalities have adopted PennDOT procurement procedures resolutions as this project will be funded 95% from federal and state funds with 5% of the funding coming from local funds. He noted that the local share was split 2.5% each with the project receiving funding from the Local Share Gaming Grant funds for engineering costs estimated at \$80,000. He explained that the last estimate to replace the bridge was \$1.3 million.

Mr. Wolfe noted that PennDOT advertised a Request for Proposal (RFP) from interested engineering firms in their electronic site as it was not advertised in a local publication. He noted that the advertisement set forth the criteria for selection, noting that there are six criteria. He noted that all Board Members present received a ranking sheet based on the six PennDOT criteria listed in the RFP for the six respondents to the RFP.

Mr. Wolfe explained that he, along with Ms. England and Leona Barr, PennDOT staffer, were able to eliminate five of the 11 responders from their initial review, providing a final list of six engineering firms. He noted that the responder's proposals that were eliminated are available

for review and consideration by both Board members. He noted that both Boards were presented copies of the RFPs from the six remaining engineering consultants.

Mr. Wolfe noted at this time it is up to the two bodies to determine the most suitable engineer for this project. He noted that the cost for services is unknown at this time and will not be made know until after a selection is made. He explained that is part of the PennDOT Federal Highway Administration Procedures. He further explained that you are not allowed to ask for costs up front, only after a selection has been made.

Mr. Wolfe noted that both Boards must take official action to choose a consultant if they are able to reach a consensus.

Mr. Hawk noted that the ranking procedure calls for six to be the highest number with one being the lowest number. Mr. Hawk suggested that Board members may have ranked a firm consistently with the same number for each category. Mr. Seeds noted that he did not do that. He explained that he gave different numbers for each criterion. He noted that the top score could be 42 but he had no one with that high a number.

Mr. Blain suggested that we should ask each Board member who they ranked the highest. He noted that it would provide both Boards with a good idea of where we are at in the process.

Mr. Crissman requested Mr. Wolfe to keep track of the tally on the board. He suggested that in the first round, Board members should list their first choice.

Mr. Don Steinmeier ranked HRG first.

Mr. Jay Megonnell ranked Rettew first.

Mr. Harold Harman ranked HRG first.

Ms. Gloria Zimmerman ranked Rettew first.

Mr. David Blain ranked HRG first.

Mr. Gary Crissman ranked HRG first.

Mr. William Hawk ranked HRG first.

Mr. William Seeds ranked Majestic and Masters first.

Mr. William Hornung ranked HRG first.

Mr. Hawk noted that HRG received the highest votes with six and he questioned the Board members if they were comfortable going with the majority vote. Ms. Zimmerman answered yes. Mr. Crissman questioned, for the three members who did not vote for HRG, if they were comfortable with the vote. Ms. Zimmerman answered she was as she had both firms almost even. Mr. Megonnell answered that he was fine with it. Mr. Seeds noted that he was comfortable as he ranked HRG second

Mr. Wolfe noted if the Board members are ready, it would be appropriate to move to select HRG as the firm you desire to perform the engineering services for the Jonestown Road Bridge, and authorize staff to transmit the selection to PennDOT.

Ms. Zimmerman questioned if we did not have a motion at one of West Hanover Township's Board meetings, that Lower Paxton Township would be the deciding factor for the engineering. Ms. England answered no. Mr. Wolfe explained that Lower Paxton Township is the lead entity when it comes for paperwork but not when it comes to deciding the consultant as it must be a joint decision.

Ms. Zimmerman made a motion to accept HRG as the engineering consultant for the Jonestown Road Bridge project. Mr. Harman seconded the motion. Mr. Megonnell called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Mr. Blain made a motion to accept HRG as the engineering consultant for the Jonestown Road Bridge project. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would notify PennDOT of the selection and the next part of the process would be to have HRG provide a price proposal. He explained that PennDOT will weigh

in on the appropriateness of the proposal allowing both Boards to select the firm based on a reasonable cost, and if the fee is perceived to be too high, there will be a negotiation process.

Mr. Crissman questioned if HRG will meet with both Boards in the future. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would be part of the design process. He noted that neither of the municipal representatives from HRG are part of the bridge division, noting that HRG will be using someone other than Al Brulo or Steve Fleming. Mr. Crissman suggested that it would be good to meet the person who will be heading the project.

Ms. England noted to clarify Ms. Zimmerman's earlier comment, the West Hanover Township Board voted to allow Lower Paxton Township to take the lead on the project; however this meeting for making a decision was going to be with both Boards. She suggested from here on out, West Hanover Township is comfortable with Lower Paxton Township taking the lead and providing reports. She noted if the representative from HRG can provide periodic updates to her Board that would be acceptable.

Mr. Seeds noted that Ed Baker will be the project manager from HRG. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Baker is familiar with the condition of the bridge as he does the inspection work for Dauphin County.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary